

## REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated October 18, 2005, having a shortened statutory period set to expire January 18, 2006. Proposed amendments are submitted for cancelling Claims 1-11, and adding Claims 12-19. Upon entry of the proposed amendments, Claims 12-19 will be pending.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101**

On page 2 of the present Office Action, Claim 11 is rejected for including an intangible medium in a computer software claim. Claim 11 is cancelled, and thus this rejection is moot.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

On page 2 of the present Office Action, Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Morimoto* (U.S. Patent No. 7,016,957 – “*Morimoto*”). These claims are now cancelled, and thus this rejection is moot.

### **New Claims**

With regards to exemplary new Claim 12, the cited art does not teach or suggest “associating an error log with an enterprise-class environment, wherein the error log records faults that are detected in a hierarchy of data storage operations in a computer system, and wherein the error log attributes a single root cause to faults in multiple data storage operations in the computer system” (as supported in the present specification by paragraph [0026] and Figure 1 and Figure 2); “passing an identity of an event causing failure through a chain of failing requests until the identity of the event causing failure reaches an originator of a request for data from one or more of the hierarchy of data storage operations, wherein the chain of failing requests, which is caused by an error in a physical storage device, is promulgated through the hierarchy of data storage operations in an upward hierarchical manner from the physical storage device to the originator of the request for data” (as supported by paragraph [0029] and Figure 1 of the present specification); and “based on the identity of the event, determining, by the

originator of the request for data, an error event and a storage device that must be repaired for each detected failure, wherein multiple errors, in the hierarchy of data storage operations, that are caused by a single fault are diagnosed to a single fault.” (See paragraphs [0022] and [0029] of the present specification for support of this feature.)

With regards to exemplary new Claim 13, the cited art does not teach or suggest “adding a unique identifier to the error log, wherein the unique identifier identifies a particular event that is capable of causing an Input/Output service to fail in the hierarchy of data storage operations, and wherein the error log contains information that details a detected fault to enable service personnel to repair a root-cause of the detected fault,” as supported by paragraph [0027] of the present specification.

With regards to exemplary new Claim 14, the cited art does not teach or suggest “using the unique identifier as part of a message, to the originator of the request for data, indicating that a service must be failed due to the error, wherein the service is provided by a component in a virtualization subsystem, wherein the virtualization subsystem is a software stack that manages the hierarchy of data storage operations, wherein the hierarchy of data storage operations includes controlling a Redundant Array of Inexpensive Disks (RAID) storage device, virtualizing memory storage, flash copying of data, and caching of data,” as supported by paragraph [0028], paragraph [0030] and Figure 1 of the present disclosure).


With regards to exemplary new Claim 15, the cited art does not teach or suggest “establishing a criticality order for applications that use data from the physical storage device; and in response to a fault in the physical storage device being repaired, restoring applications in order of criticality, wherein a most critical application is restored first,” as supported by paragraph [0029] of the present specification.

### CONCLUSION

As the cited art does not teach or suggest all claimed features, Applicants now respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

No extension of time for this response is believed to be necessary. However, in the event an extension of time is required, that extension of time is hereby requested. Please charge any fee associated with an extension of time as well as any other fee necessary to further the prosecution of this application to **IBM CORPORATION DEPOSIT ACCOUNT No. 09-0449**.

Respectfully submitted,



James E. Boice

*Registration No. 44,545*

DILLON & YUDELL LLP

8911 North Capital of Texas Highway

Suite 2110

Austin, Texas 78759

512.343.6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)